

November 15, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 15285

[Mr. PUCINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THE GOOD SHIP SINKS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will say I am not going to object, but I am going to reiterate what I said yesterday evening. This is no reflection on the gentleman from Ohio. I have no objection to his speaking at any time he wants to. I always like to hear him. However, I do think when we have important matters like the one presently before us we ought to get on with it as best we can and not take the time of so many rollcalls during the 1-minute speeches. I want to make that clear.

I am not going to object to this one and I will not object to any more, but in the interest of expediting the business of the House, having said as much yesterday evening, I want to say it again, because there are more people here now than there were yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I was just going to make some very brief remarks on the subject of a shipwreck which occurred on a "Black" night last night in California when the good ship "Lollipop" went down. I just wanted to point out that the whole thing after today has a Hollywood, Alice in Wonderland character because the defeated candidate said she would be back. She has not been here yet, so how can she be back?

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. FARBERSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Security Council to reach any agreement on the continuing crisis in the Middle East emphasizes the burden that rests with the United States for keeping the peace. Once again, the Arab States, in the Security Council negotiations, reveal their detachment from reality. Having threatened Israel with annihilation last spring, they continue to insist that Israel forswear all the benefits of the war they provoked, without their renouncing their evil objectives. Mr. Speaker, this detachment from reality may very well lead the Arabs into starting another round of fighting, as the Jordanian foreign minister himself indicated. Such fighting would serve only Russia's purposes. I trust that our Government will see to it that Israel is kept so strong that sensible Arabs will understand the inevitable futility of any resumption of the war.

U.S. FLIGHTS OVER CHINA

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, it is with grave concern that I point out a remark attributed to a State Department spokesman in a recent editorial in the Saturday Review about flights by U.S. planes over Chinese territory.

According to this spokesman, and I quote the editorial:

There is nothing new about flights by United States planes over Chinese territory. United States military planes have been flying authorized missions over Communist China for several years.

Further, the State Department spokesman, according to the editorial, stated that Communist China has full knowledge and understanding of our military flights over her territory and does not regard them as provocative.

Mr. Speaker, I view this revelation with great alarm. I would like to ask, first, is this true? And, if it is true, does it not pose a grave risk of all-out nuclear warfare with China's 750 million people?

Further, as the editorial points out, if China "understands" our flights over its sovereign territory, why did China recently shoot down two U.S. planes which our authorities assured us had "mistakenly wandered off course"?

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I am overstating the case when I say that the answers to these questions involve no less than the fate of this Nation in an all-out nuclear confrontation with China and the Communist bloc.

INVITATION EXTENDED TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO VISIT HISTORIC FREDERICKSBURG

(Mr. SCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, by this time Members of the House have probably all received an invitation to visit historic Fredericksburg, from the mayor, Josiah P. Rowe III. I would like to recommend this trip, which is just an hour's drive from Washington along Interstate Route 95, in the center of my congressional district, and one of the many pleasant historic spots in the district.

For those of you who are not too familiar with Virginia's history, you will be well rewarded by a relaxing visit as well as a lesson in the early development of our country.

RESERVE FORCES BILL OF RIGHTS AND VITALIZATION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2) to amend titles 10, 14, 32, and 37, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 14, 1967.)

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, this conference report today brings us to the end of a long, long trail which started some 3 years ago.

H.R. 2, as reported by the conferees, is a highly significant legislative item affecting the future of all our Reserve components.

The common objective of the entire bill is to provide for a number of organizational changes which enable our Reserves to more effectively fulfill their role as a vital part of our national defense forces.

I will not attempt to review every specific provision in the bill. However, suffice it to say, each of the provisions in the bill will contribute significantly toward providing us with a genuinely combat ready Reserve force.

The bill, as agreed to by the conferees, creates a Selected Reserve in each of the Reserve components with the requirement that there be an annual authorization for the strength of these Selected Reserves before pay and allowances can be appropriated by the Congress.

Thus, this bill provides a new statutory basis for that portion of our seven Reserve components which will receive the highest priority in terms of personnel, training, and equipment. This is the Selected Reserve which necessarily represents the first line of defense in our Ready Reserve Forces.

The Congress, as well as the American public, is well aware of the unfortunate lack of combat readiness in our Reserve components. A significant contributing factor to this unfortunate condition is the historic failure of the Department of Defense and the individual service departments to adequately support these various Reserve components in terms of personnel, training, and equipment.

Under the terms of this bill there is a statutory mandate making each of the Secretaries having Ready Reserve Forces within their Department personally responsible for the personnel, equipment, facilities, and logistical support necessary to fully satisfy the training and mobilization requirements for these elements of our Ready Reserve Force.

This provision clearly establishes the intent of Congress that our civilian Secretaries must take all the steps necessary within their Departments to insure that our Reserve components, particularly those in the Selected Reserve, will satisfy their training and mobilization requirements and thereby achieve the high state of readiness which is essential to the fulfillment of our war and contingency planning.

Unfortunately, one of the key provisions in the bill relating to the establishment of a retirement program for National Guard technicians did not survive the conference. Every House conferee felt most strongly that it was essential that our dedicated National Guard technicians be given the benefits now pro-

H15286

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

November 15, 1967

vided our Federal employees in respect to retirement, medicare, et cetera. We all felt, and I might add that the Senate conferees generally shared this view, that we must do something very quickly to insure that our National Guard will continue to be manned in the most vital positions by dedicated career technicians. Despite the position of the House conferees, the Senate conferees were of the view that the proposal recommended by the Department of Defense and passed by the House embraced many vital problems whose resolution, in their judgment, was quite unclear. Therefore, the Senate conferees were absolutely adamant in their unwillingness to include any provision in this bill which would establish a retirement program for National Guard technicians. However, the Senate conferees agreed that in view of the critical nature of this problem, they would reconsider this provision of H.R. 2 early in the next session of the Congress. It was on this basis that the House conferees agreed to recede from their position and accept the Senate action.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to the Members of the House that this piece of legislation is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we have considered in many, many years. It insures the economy of operation and the integrity of the Reserves and of the National Guard. It makes it compulsory upon the part of the Department of Defense to make a report every year in order that we may review the Reserve situation as administered by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, it returns the legislative prerogative insofar as the personnel strengths of the Reserve Forces are concerned, to the House Armed Services Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee. This removes from the Committee on Appropriations the necessity of including legislation on this matter in the annual Department of Defense appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, this position is concurred in by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has long sought to give to the legislative committee of the House of Representatives its full jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the conference report is adopted. I have nothing further to add except this: I would feel remiss if I did not pay a compliment to the members of my subcommittee, and particularly to my opposite member on the Republican side, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], who has been a very strong individual in helping the subcommittee resolve this complex problem.

I also wish to pay tribute and to give credit for the complete support given to me by the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, MENDEL RIVERS. At no time was the subcommittee handicapped or given any instructions other than full support of our efforts. I am sure every member of my subcommittee appreciates the attitude of the chairman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the author of the bill H.R. 2.

Passage of this measure has indeed been a long and rocky road. Nevertheless, the measure now before us represents a definite step forward. It provides stabilizing factors which we have long needed in the efforts to insure that America will have strong and effective Reserve components. H.R. 2 as it passed the House, provided additional guarantees that are not spelled out in the present version, but I recognize the fact the bill now before us is the best solution which could be achieved in conference.

It is very important that the terms of this bill be implemented speedily and that advantage be taken of the cooperative attitude which now exists between the Congress and the Pentagon to provide more efficiency and greater readiness in the Reserves. I am certain there is general satisfaction in the fact that such an opportunity now is provided. The gentleman from Louisiana and his committee have rendered a valuable service which I feel will be reflected in an improved and more effective Reserve organization and consequently in a stronger national defense.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana has set out very clearly the details of this conference report. This is, as has been said, the end of a long road in attempting to bring some understanding and stability out of the chaos existing in the present administration of Reserve affairs.

If the Members of this body will recall, the second bill passed this year was this bill, H.R. 2. It was one of the earlier bills passed the year before and, as I recall, even before that, but we were never able to get the Senate to act on it. This time they did act, and as soon as they acted the conference committee was appointed and met.

Mr. Speaker, generally this is a very good bill, but frankly it is not, in my opinion, as good a bill as left the House, and I shall explain the reasons for this statement.

First, the other body did eliminate the retirement technician program, but there is a logical reason for this action. Many States have different regulations on the subject of technician retirement. It is going to take time and very careful study to prepare proper legislation to cover this. If this bill had been passed and had become law at the time it was originally passed by this body, we would not have had that problem because, since that time, many of the States have passed regulations that must be considered in the enactment of proper legislation on the retirement pay of Reserve and Guard technicians. Many of these laws had not been passed by the States

at the time the House originally passed this bill.

There is another matter that I regret that we had to agree to in the conference. The House had made arrangements in our bill for the appointment from civilian life of an Assistant Secretary in Charge of Reserve Guard Affairs, to be approved and confirmed by the Senate. This was very fine. The other body in their bill had set up a deputy to the Assistant Secretary, also to be confirmed by the Senate. The House version of this is clearly superior to that of the Senate. This gives the Secretary the prestige and influence that he so badly needs.

I will tell the Members of the House very frankly that the House conferees worked diligently to get the Senate to accept our version, but we were unsuccessful. I hope that the accepted version works satisfactorily. If it doesn't, we have the promise of the Senate conferees to go into the matter next year.

But, Mr. Speaker, in summing it up, I will say this is a very good bill, and it is absolutely necessary, because the desire of the Department of Defense for the last 6 years was to make continual changes in the status, strength, and units of the National Guard and the Reserve.

Every year, the Office of the Secretary of Defense had new ideas as to making major changes usually to cut down the strength of the Reserve components. These actions threw the whole Reserve and Guard into a very difficult position because they could not plan. Such actions and attempted actions on the part of the Secretary of Defense was detrimental to the morale and effectiveness of our Reserve components. This, in my opinion, contributed a great deal to the many Reserve problems that we have.

In order to really save the Reserves and Guard, in the past, we had to legislate on an appropriation bill to fix the Reserve and Guard strength which we never like to do unless it is necessary.

But I do want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for saving the stability of the Guard and the Reserve until we could get this bill passed.

Now the strength will be fixed by the legislative body, the legislative committees, which always should have been the case—but it was impossible to do so until this legislation, H.R. 2, was passed.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to say that this legislation is the "Reserve bill of rights," and while not as good a bill as passed the House, it is a good bill and with the action as promised by the Senate conferees next year, this legislation shall be the cornerstone making an era of better and more capable Reserve components in the years to come.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana and his conferees for the job they have done both in passing the original bill H.R. 2 with regard to Reserve components of the armed services and in working out this agreement with the Senate, though I am sure there will be disap-